

## **DELEGATED HOUSEHOLDER APPLICATION REPORT**

**Application No:** 191273/HOU

**Address:** 45 Church End Lane

**Applicant:** Mr Winston Best

**Proposal:** Single storey rear extension

**Target date:** 30/09/19

**EOT:** 22/10/19

**Case officer:** Connie Davis

### **Site Description and Surrounding Area:**

The application site is a two storey semi-detached property located on the eastern side of Church End Lane. The property is finished in white render at ground and first floor level. To the rear, the property has a small (assumed to be original) outrigger.

The application site is not listed, nor in a conservation area.

### **Proposal:**

Householder planning permission is sought for the erection of a single storey rear extension. The extension would measure a depth of 4.5m, maximum height of 3.25m and width of 5.4m. It would have a flat roof and other materials would match the existing property.

### **Plans Considered:**

L-01 - Location Plan

S-01 - Block Plans As Existing

S-02 - Floor Plans, Elevations & Section As Existing

Received 6<sup>th</sup> August 2019

P-01 Rev B - Block Plans As Proposed

P-02 Rev B - Floor Plans As Proposed

P-03 Rev B - Elevations & Section As Proposed

Received 15<sup>th</sup> October 2019

### **Relevant Planning History:**

991115 - Single storey side extension to provide garage - Application Permitted

### **Consultation Responses:**

#### **Internal Consultees**

No internal consultees were consulted on this application.

#### **External Consultation**

The following addresses were formally consulted via letter on 07/08/19:

43 and 47 Church End Lane

## 6 Royston Close

In addition a site notice was displayed between 16/08/19 - 06/09/19.

One objection was received from the adjoining property (no. 47 Church End Lane). The concerns that were raised related to the following:

- 'The extension would be overbearing , reduce light and Combining the 7m extension with the average overall height of approx. 3.2m will impose on me an overbearing intrusive block of approx. 22 m2'.

***Officer comment: The depth of the extension was reduced to 4.5m following on from this comment (and to be considered more in keeping with Policy DM9).***

- 'Extension protrudes in an Easterly direction such size and positioning of development will remove, adversely affect the light, will cast overshadowing & spoil long enjoyed views'

***Officer Comment: See appraisal section for analysis on the affect on light/ overshadowing. The affect on views cannot be considered as part of a planning application.***

- 'Proposed elevation & section plans are confusing and need to ensure no windows are overlooking or opening onto my property'.

***Officer comment: No windows are proposed on the side elevation facing no. 47.***

Confirmation that the roof fall allows for rainwater to flow and fall into guttering installed above patio doors shown on proposed rear elevation.

***Officer comment: It is the responsibility of the developer to ensure this. From a planning perspective, it just needs to be ensured that no form of the development (including guttering) encroaches on neighbouring land.***

Following the receipt of revised plans, further comments were received from the same neighbour:

- The extension would breach the 4m guidance in the 'A Design Guide to House Extensions' and this should be measured from the original house

***Officer comment: See appraisal below. The extension would measure 4.5m from the original house along the boundary with no. 47, rather than from the existing small coal store projection.***

- The extension would breach the 45 degree light angle stated in 'A Design Guide to House Extensions'

***Officer comment: See appraisal below.***

Discussions with applicant/ agent

Over the course of the application the depth of the rear extension was reduced from in excess of 7m to 4.5m following the objection from the adjacent neighbouring property.

#### **Equality Act 2010:**

In determining this application the Council is required to have regard to its obligations under the Equality Act 2010. However, there is no indication or evidence (including from consultation on the application) that the protected groups identified by the Act have or will have different needs, experiences, issues and priorities in relation to this particular planning application. Therefore in terms of the key equalities protected characteristics it is considered there would be no significant adverse impacts as a result of the development.

#### **Relevant Planning Policy and Guidance**

Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 requires that proposals be determined in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. Material considerations include relevant policies in the National Planning Policy framework (NPPF) - among them the 'presumption in favour of sustainable development'.

The following local and national planning policy and guidance is relevant to this application:

#### **National**

National Planning Policy Framework;  
National Planning Policy Guidance;

#### **RBC Local Development Framework**

##### **Core Strategy 2008 (Altered 2015)**

CS7 Design and the Public Realm

##### **Sites and Detailed Policies Document 2012 (Altered 2015)**

DM4 Safeguarding Amenity

DM9 House Extensions and Ancillary Accommodation

DM10 Private and Communal Amenity Space

Supplementary Planning Guidance - A Design Guide to House Extensions (2003)

#### **Appraisal Checklist**

DM9 states: An extension to a house will be acceptable where it:

- A. Respects the character of the house in terms of scale, location, materials and design;

To assess this, the following has been considered - would the proposal:

- detract from the appearance of the original building through the use of ill-matching materials and by not fitting in with the design, scale and proportions of the original building; **NO, the proposed extension, by way of its overall design, is considered acceptable.** It is noted that the extension breaches the Council's guidance on rear extensions not projecting a depth greater than 4m, however this will be further discussed below.

- reduce the amount of usable amenity space for the property to an unacceptable degree; **NO**, the amount of useable amenity space that would be retained is considered acceptable.
  - require the loss of trees in the garden or put significant trees at risk; **NO**
- B. Respects the character and pattern of neighbouring properties and the street as a whole in terms of scale, location, materials and design, and any important existing building line; Respects neighbour's amenities and does not present a large blank façade to public areas.

To assess this, the following has been considered - would the proposal:

- significantly reduce the amount of daylight and sunlight enjoyed by neighbouring properties; **It should be noted that most developments will cause some impact to some neighbours, however the LPA has to assess whether this impact would cause substantial harm to an unacceptable degree.**

The objection raised by the adjacent neighbour stated that the proposed extension (at the reduced 4.5m depth) is in breach of the 45 degree light angle, as specified in the 'A Design Guide to House Extensions' SPG. However it should be noted that this measurement is generally applied in relation to two storey extensions.

The SPG states that rear extensions should generally not project past 4m. However this is guidance and each application is assessed on a case by case basis. It is not considered that the additional 0.5m is substantial enough to warrant refusal of the application. This is given the relatively high boundary wall that is in place and therefore, on balance, the extension is not considered to cause a loss of light to an unacceptable degree due to the existing boundary treatment and the fact the extension would not be south facing. It is also not considered that the extension would overshadow the neighbouring property to an unacceptable degree for this same reason.

The height of the proposed extension would be 3.25m. Under Permitted development (which would not require permission), an extension on this property could be built which measures 4m in height and 3m in depth. Therefore the height of the extension is considered acceptable.

The proposal is considered suitably set off the boundary with no. 43 and therefore it is not considered any conflict would be created.

- invade the privacy of neighbouring properties through overlooking from windows or balconies; **NO**, no windows are proposed on the side elevation facing no. 47.

There is one window proposed on the side elevation facing no. 43, however this is not considered to invade the privacy of this neighbour due to being set off the boundary and the high boundary treatment in place. No objections have been received from this neighbour.

- detract from the character of neighbouring properties through siting, excessive bulk, ill-matching materials or inconsistent design; **NO, the proposal would not be visible from the street.**
- detract from the appearance of the street or area by using ill-matched materials, glazing and detailing; **NO, materials have been selected to match the host dwelling.**

DM4: Safeguarding Amenity states an extension to a house will be acceptable where it will not cause a significant detrimental impact to the living environment of existing or new residential properties.

To assess this, the following has been considered - would the proposal cause a significant detrimental impact to the living environment of existing or new residential properties in terms of:

- Privacy and overlooking; **NO, discussed above**
- Access to sunlight and daylight; **NO, discussed above**
- Visual dominance and overbearing effects of a development; **NO, discussed above**
- Noise and disturbance; **NO**
- Artificial lighting; **NO**
- Vibration; **NO**
- Dust and fumes; **NO**
- Smell; **NO**
- Crime and safety; **NO**

### **Conclusion**

The proposed development would not be harmful to the character or appearance of the site or its surroundings and would not have a detrimental impact on the original building or neighbouring properties. As such the proposed works are considered to be in accordance with CS7 (Design and the Public Realm) of the Reading Borough Local Development Framework Core Strategy (2008), DM4: Safeguarding Amenity and DM9: House Extensions and Ancillary Accommodation of the Sites and Detailed Policies Document (Oct 2012) and the Councils Supplementary Planning Guidance A Design Guide to House Extensions (2003).

### **RECOMMENDATION: GRANT PERMISSION**

#### **Conditions**

1. TL1 - 3 year time limit.
2. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans:

L-01 - Location Plan

Received 6<sup>th</sup> August 2019

P-01 Rev B - Block Plans As Proposed

P-02 Rev B - Floor Plans As Proposed

P-03 Rev B - Elevations & Section As Proposed

Received 15<sup>th</sup> October 2019

Reason: because permission is granted in respect of the development as detailed in the approved plans only.

3. The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of this development shall be:

Painted render to match the existing

Dark grey flat roof membrane

White PVCu windows and doors to match the existing

as shown on the approved plans or documents.

The development shall be completed using the approved materials and details before the building is occupied.

Reason: in the interests of ensuring that the new development appears in keeping with the existing building or surrounding area in accordance with Policy CS7 and DM9.

**Informatives**

1. Building Control
2. Construction & Demolition
3. Terms
4. Encroachment
5. Positive and Proactive

**1HA**